

REMARKS


The Examiner has rejected claims 1-5, 7-9 and 11-19 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,601,269 to Jankovic. Claim 1 was amended to include the limitations of allowed claim 20 and, therefore, is allowable. Since claims 2, 3, 5, 9-15, 17-19 are dependent on claim 1, they also are allowable.

Independent claims 4, 7, 8, and 16 have also been amended to include the limitations of claim 20. Applicants now believe that claims 4, 7, 8, and 16 are patentable over the cited references in a similar manner as claim 1 and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

Claims 21-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Jankovic reference in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0189168 to Sicuranza. Applicants argue that neither the Jankovic reference nor the Sicuranza reference, whether taken individually or in combination, disclose or suggest the combination of claim 21. The Jankovic reference discloses a motorized cup holder assembly retractable within a cavity of a center console. The Jankovic reference does not teach or suggest a door body for selectively covering an opening of a storage compartment in an interior component. As shown in Fig. 4 of the Jankovic reference, the collapsible holders 28 and 30 do not cover an opening of a storage compartment. Instead, the collapsible holders 28 and 30 simply retract within a recess or cavity 14 of the console. The Sicuranza reference discloses a system for either preventing movement or braking the movement of a vehicle door if the presence of an object, such as a hand of a person, is sensed between the open door and the body of the vehicle. Even if it could be determined that the Jankovic reference suggests a movable door body for selectively covering an opening, the combination of the Jankovic and Sicuranza references do not suggest a controller for receiving a signal from a sensor and operating an actuator to enable a door body to move relative to a vehicle component. Instead, the Sicuranza reference specifically teaches the opposite, and a combination of the Jankovic and Sicuranza references would suggest a controller for receiving a signal from a sensor and operating an actuator to prevent a door body from moving. The Examiner agrees with this position as stated at the last paragraph on page 6 of the Office Action in that it "would have been

obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the door assembly of the Jankovic reference with a filed effect sensor, as taught by the Sicuranza reference, in order to prevent the door movement." For these reasons, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection of claims 21-24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Respectfully submitted,

  
Scott A. Blake  
Reg. No. 40,515

MacMillan, Sobanski & Todd, LLC  
One Maritime Plaza, Fourth Floor  
720 Water Street  
Toledo, Ohio 43604  
(419) 255-5900